

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-16 will be pending in the application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that the claims do not recite the structural relationship of the "pivot unit" that allows the pivot unit to set the inclination angle of the idle roller. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to more clearly define the structural relationship between the pivot unit, the idle roller and the side wall guide. The pivot unit, as described in the specification at pages 8-10 and FIGs. 5-7, elastically biases the idle roller relative to the side wall guide, such that papers having different characteristics such as different weight, provide different repulsive forces that overcome the elastic bias of the pivot unit to a greater or lesser degree. Accordingly, the pivot unit sets the inclination angle of the idle roller relative to the side wall guide according to the type of paper. Because the structural relationship between the pivot unit and the idle roller is now claimed more clearly, the rejection is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,687,886 to Pitner. The Examiner cites the pivot pin 36, roller bracket 37, adjusting stud 44 and lock nut 45 as anticipating the pivot unit of the present invention. However, as amended, claim 8 recites further structural relationship between the pivot unit of embodiments of the present invention and the

idle roller. More specifically, the pivot unit elastically biases the idle roller relative to the sidewall to set the inclination angle of the idle roller relative to the sidewall within a predetermined range according to a type of paper. The angle adjustment mechanism shown in Pitner must be manually adjusted to change angle, and does not elastically bias the idle roller relative to the sidewall. Accordingly, Pitner is incapable of setting the inclination angle *according to a type of paper*. Rather, Pitner can only change the inclination angle of the roller 40 by manually adjusting the adjusting stud 44 and lock nut 45. Accordingly, claim 8 is not anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,053,494 to Baskette et al. in view of Pitner. The Examiner admits that Baskette does not teach setting the inclination angle according to a type or characteristic of paper. However, the Examiner cites Pitner as disclosing this feature.

Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendment to independent claims 1, 8 and 15. The amendment clarifies that the pivot unit as claimed elastically biases the idle roller relative to the side wall guide, to set the inclination angle of the idle roller *according to a type or characteristic of the paper*. As discussed above and in the specification, different weighted paper provides differing repulsive forces, which are overcome to a greater or lesser degree by the biasing pivot unit. Accordingly, the pivot unit as claimed sets the inclination angle of the idle roller relative to the side wall guide according to a type of paper. Neither Baskette nor Pitner teach or reasonably suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-4, 9-11 and 16 depend from the independent claims, and are accordingly allowable for at least the same reason as discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskette in view of Pitner and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,915,449 to Johnson et al. The Examiner cites Johnson as teaching a pivoting unit having an elastic member (68) that supports one side of an idle roller rotation shaft holder (58). However, Johnson changes the angle of inclination via a solenoid based on the *direction of travel* of the paper, not a type or characteristic of the paper. Accordingly, neither Johnson, nor Baskette or Pitner teach a pivot unit that *elastically biases the idle roller relative to the side wall guide* to set the inclination angle of the idle roller relative to the side wall guide within a predetermined range *according to a type or characteristic of the paper*. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.


The Examiner has rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Pitner. The Examiner suggest that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set the angles between 4 and 9 or between 5 and 8 degrees. However, as discussed above, Pitner fails to teach other limitations of claim 8. Namely, Pitner fails to teach or suggest a pivot unit that *elastically biases the idle roller relative to the side wall guide* to set the inclination angle of the idle roller relative to the side wall guide within a predetermined range *according to a type or characteristic of the paper*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Appl. No. 10/630,793
Amdt. Dated September 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2006

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 7 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitner in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,947,022 to Kockler. The Examiner cites Kockler as teaching a pressing unit that provides elastic force to an idle roller toward a duplex transfer roller. However, even assuming that this is true, Kockler fails to make up for the deficiencies in Pitner noted above. Namely, neither Pitner nor Kockler teach or suggest a pivot unit that *elastically biases the idle roller relative to the side wall guide* to set the inclination angle of the idle roller relative to the side wall guide within a predetermined range *according to a type or characteristic of the paper*. Accordingly, allowance of claims 1, 3-4, 7 and 14-16 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,


Christian C. Michel
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,300

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: September 14, 2006